



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
ELlicott CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

April Minutes

The third regular meeting for the year 2015 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, April 2, 2015 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Eileen Tennor, Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; Joseph Hauser; and Bruno Reich

Members absent: Allan Shad

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Carol Stirn

Chairperson Tennor opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Roth moved to Approve the March 12, 2015 minutes. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 15-12 – 4730 Sheppard Lane, Ellicott City, HO-907
2. 15-13 – 8357 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 15-15 – 8321 Main Street, Ellicott City
4. 15-16 – 10070 Baltimore National Pike, Ellicott City, HO-767
5. 15-17 – 6415 Beechfield Avenue, Elkridge
6. 15-18 – 8086 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 15-14 – 8086 Main Street, Ellicott City
8. 15-19 – 3765 Church Road, Ellicott City
9. 15-20 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
10. 15-21 – 3713 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
11. 15-22 – 6130 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge

CONSENT AGENDA

15-12 – 4730 Sheppard Lane, Ellicott City, HO-907

Tax credit pre-approval for exterior repairs.

Applicant: Daniel J. Standish

Background & Scope of Work: This property is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory, as HO-907, Richland Farm. The property contains several historic building, but the current application concerns the Superintendent/Overseer's house, which dates to approximately 1919.

The application explains that the porch is rotting and falling apart. The Applicant proposes to replace the gray enamel coated pine floors to match the existing. The porch ceiling was repaired in the 1960s with

plywood, which will now be replaced with pine beadboard to match the ceiling of the porch on the main house (which also dates to 1919). The footings for the porch will be replaced and covered with rubblestone veneer to match the rubblestone veneer used on the other 18th and 19th century buildings on the property. The porch columns will be retained and reused. Perimeter posts and rails will be installed to match the originals as shown in a photograph included with the application.

Staff Comments: The application complies with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. The Applicant will be restoring the building to match the original materials and design, and will reuse items in good condition. The application also complies with Section 20.112 of the County Code requirements for tax credits.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-13 – 8357 Main Street, Ellicott City

Replace windows, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Jane O’Leary

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1900. The Applicant proposes to replace the wood windows with 6:6 wood windows to match the existing. The windows will fit into the existing openings, with no change to the original granite lintels or sills. The new windows will be painted the same color as they are now, Benjamin Moore Philadelphia Cream, HC-30.

Based upon documentation from the file, it appears the windows were replaced in the summer of 1979. The Applicant has previously had the windows repaired to open and close properly, but has determined the repairs were not successful.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.H recommendations, “when repair is not possible, replace original windows, frames and related details with features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, material, finish and window pane configuration. If possible, reproduce frame size and profile and muntin detailing.” The current windows are not original to the building and the Applicant has already tried to have them repaired.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-15 – 8321 Main Street, Ellicott City

Install sign.

Applicant: Diane Adlestein

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to install a sign on to an existing projecting sign. The new sign will be located below the sign for the Ellicott City Historic District Partnership and attached with chains or hooks. The proposed sign will be of the same dimensions, about 11 inches high by 25 inches wide, for a total of approximately 2 square feet. The sign will have an off-white/cream background with black text. The sign will read on two lines:

Diane Adlestein, Ph.D.

Licensed Psychologist

Staff Comments: The sign complies with Chapter 11 recommendations for signs. The proposed sign will use simple, legible words and graphics, as recommend. The sign also complies with Chapter 11.A recommendations, “keep letters to a minimum and the message brief and to the point” and “use a minimum of colors, generally no more than three.” The sign will be made from wood, which complies with Chapter 11.A recommendations, “use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.” The size of this hanging sign will be around 2 square feet, which complies with the Guidelines, which recommend projecting or hanging signs be 4 to 6 square feet.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

15-16 – 10070 Baltimore National Pike, Ellicott City, HO-767

Advisory Comments for demolition/relocation

Applicant: Kimco Realty Corporation, Gregory H. Reed

Background & Scope of Work: This site is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-767, the Enchanted Forest. Many of the structures have been relocated to Elioak Farm, however there are still some structures remaining on site. The Applicant proposes to relocate the Story Book, Dragon and the front part of the Castle, which are located at the entry way to the shopping center. Those structures will be relocated to Elioak Farm. The King will remain on the shopping center sign. The rear of the castle and the remaining structures such as Cinderella’s Castle, the Gingerbread House and some other structures, will be demolished as they are in very poor condition. The boardwalk around the large pond in the rear will be removed, as the wood is rotting. The large pond will remain and functions as stormwater management for the shopping center. The application states that the site will be stabilized with seeding, mulch and landscaping after the demolition.

Staff Comments: The remaining structures have been neglected and exposed to the elements over the years and are in very poor condition. There are some interesting landscape elements remaining, such as two different types of stone retaining walls, which are in good condition. Overall, Staff has no objection to the demolition as the structures are beyond saving, and the ones that can be saved will be moved.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Greg Reed, Director of Acquisitions for Kimco Realty Corporation. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Reed stated he has worked with Martha Clark, from Elioak Farm, walked the property and looked at the remaining structures to see which ones Ms. Clark has interest in. Mr. Reed said the only structures with any integrity left and still looked in good shape are the front castle. Reports have been done concerning the asbestos and a lead paint evaluation, as the castle contains both of these elements inside and will have to be removed. Once this is done, these items will be relocated to the Elioak Farm. A majority of the other pieces, which were in good shape, have already been relocated to the farm. Ms. Tennor swore in Martha Clark. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or changes to the Staff comments. Ms. Clark stated she is looking forward to working with Kimco again to relocate the last of the pieces to Elioak Farm. Ms. Tennor clarified that Kimco is responsible for moving the pieces. Mr. Reed stated that was correct. He explained that there is some structural damage to the castle and it is falling down. The decision was made not to move the entire castle, but just the façade, as this would be more manageable. The façade will have to be moved in pieces due to power line crossings. Ms. Clark added that previous items also had to be moved by pieces and then put back together. She said the façade is really the significant piece and it will be reconstructed once moved.

Mr. Reich asked about the storybook house and if it is also being moved. Mr. Reed stated no, it will be taken down. The storybook house is damaged and is falling down. Mr. Reed explained that most of the structures were built from wood and due to their age the structures have not held up. Ms. Clark stated because of the location of the storybook house, it was not accessible to move it. She said it is wedged behind the new buildings and there are a lot of power lines in that location. Ms. Clark stated that every item that was possible to move was done.

Mr. Reich clarified that the castle façade will be moved and the remainder will be demolished. Mr. Reed stated yes. Mr. Reich asked why the remaining structures will be demolished and if something else was planned for the area. Mr. Reed stated no future improvements are planned. He said the reason for the demolition is that the structures are falling down and no longer structurally safe. The goal is to salvage what is in good condition and demolish the rest.

Mr. Reich asked about the location of the retaining wall and area for the stormwater management; will this become a parking lot or something else. Mr. Reed stated the work in that area is complete. There was some disturbance so wetland permits had to be obtained. The area is for stormwater management only. Mr. Reed explained the pad site out front was constructed for a different building that did not end up getting constructed. Mr. Reich asked if this is the reason for removing the castle. Mr. Reed said it was not and explained that this has already been built around the castle. The castle has since deteriorated much more since that time.

Mr. Reich said that after walking through some of the other buildings, such as Cinderella's Castle and the house with the ice cream cone, even though they are showing some signs of rotting and deterioration, he feels the structures are still sturdy and could be repaired and saved. Mr. Hauser said the problem is they would need to be moved from their location.

Mr. Reich asked for clarification regarding the Commission's role for Advisory Comments. Mr. Reed stated that possibly moving both of these pieces was discussed, but due to the location and the size of the castle and the costs needed for moving, it was not feasible. Mr. Reed said they look into moving both pieces. He explained that the cost to move the castle, dragon and turrets is over \$60,000. There were some moving companies which did look at the castle and the cost alone for the castle to be moved would have been extremely expensive. There is a concern for the safety of anyone going back and trying to go through the buildings, as they are not safe. Mr. Reich asked if the mountain structure in the middle of the pond will be demolished. Mr. Reed stated this will not be demolished because of the damage

being done to the pond around it and would be unsafe to try and access the area. Ms. Clark suggested placing a fence around the area so it is not accessible. Mr. Reich commented that it is great that a lot of the pieces have been saved, but would have hoped the remainder could also be saved. Ms. Clark stated a lot of time was put into figuring how to move the remaining pieces, but the pieces were too big.

Ms. Tennor asked if a budget had been established for the relocation of the items and then bids received to determine if it was feasible to move the items. She asked how the decision was made that costs were prohibitive to do the move. Mr. Reed stated some of the decision was financial and some was due to locations and the physical constraints of trying to remove a building. There are too many new buildings, parking areas, power lines to deal with. The power lines would need to be taken down, which shuts down electricity to the shopping center. Ms. Tennor commented there are good photographic records of all the items that were part of the Enchanted Forest.

Mr. Reich stated he can understand that Cinderella's Castle would be too expensive to move because it is all concrete and block. He said that the grading is flat and it is possible to drive up to the Gingerbread House and Snow White's house. Mr. Reich asked if Ms. Clark would be interested in the other buildings if they found a way to move both items to Elioak Farm. Ms. Clark stated yes.

Mr. Reich asked about preserving Cinderella's Castle instead of demolition. Mr. Reed stated the castle is deteriorating and is a liability concern. Ms. Clark commented she does not like the thought of demolishing the castle, but there is a big safety concern, and a big expense for Kimco to keep the castle up just to have it remain. Mr. Reich asked if a security fence could be placed around the building to keep people out. Mr. Reed stated there are significant structural cracks in the block. There is too much liability in the event the structure falls or falls with someone inside.

Mr. Hauser thanked Ms. Clark and Mr. Reed for all that has been done with the Enchanted Forest and having it at Eliok Farm. Mr. Hauser agrees that the remaining pieces of Enchanted Forest should be made safe either through removal or demolition, as some of the pieces could never be removed. Mr. Hauser agrees with the plan and stated what has been done is great for the County. Mr. Bennett asked if the retaining walls will be saved and maintained. Mr. Reed stated yes, there are no plans to remove them and that the retaining walls will remain.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application as submitted. Mr. Roth seconded. Ms. Tennor, Mr. Roth, and Mr. Hauser voted in favor of approval. Mr. Reich opposed.

15-17 – 6415 Beechfield Avenue, Elkridge

Advisory comments for site development plan with demolition.

Applicant: Stephanie Porta

Background & Scope of Work: This property dates to approximately to 1907. This property is not located in a historic district and is not listed on the Historic Sites Inventory, but is a historic structure. This application is only for Advisory Comments, not a Certificate of Approval. The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing structure and build a new duplex house. The architectural historian has documented the property and provided the following excerpt on the property:

In 1905 Henry and Anna Reimensnyder of Anne Arundel County purchased four adjoining lots on Beechfield Avenue and probably built the existing house at 6415 in the ensuing year or two. This is one of the earliest houses in the neighborhood, and one of only a handful of early ones that survive. The house is a traditional center-passage plan with one room to each side (a parlor to the right and dining room to the left), and a single room in a rear kitchen ell. The form remained popular throughout the

nineteenth century, but was updated stylistically here with the cross gable on the front. Henry described himself as a farmer and blacksmith (his father, Charles, was also a blacksmith), and he and Anna had four children by the time they sold this house in 1920 to Louis and Mae Smith. The Smiths lived here for 37 years, only to be exceeded by the fourth owners, Charles and Annie Brown, who lived here from 1964 until very recently. Despite the addition of paneling and drop ceilings on the interior by the Browns and aluminum siding over the original wood shingles on the exterior, much of the historic character of the house survives.

Staff Comments: This is one of the last remaining historic houses in Harwood Park, which dates to the 1890s and was developed along the Washington Branch of the B&O Railroad. Staff would prefer to see the house rehabilitated and saved. However, as this property is not located in a local historic district, there are no laws preventing the demolition. Staff recommends the house be deconstructed and the materials donated to an architectural salvage company so the materials can be reused in renovations of other historic homes.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Stephanie Porta and John Carney (Benchmark Engineering). Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Porta stated she contacted Second Chance, which was recommended to her by Ken Short, and left messages regarding if they were interested in salvaging any of the materials. There has been no reply as of yet. Ms. Porta also contacted BTN Salvage Company and spoke with a Mr. Evans who was possibly interested in taking some of the materials. Ms. Porta has not heard back from him yet. Ms. Porta's husband is planning to save a lot of the floor joists. The plan is to demolish the house.

Mr. Hauser said the Commission prefers to see the old houses in Howard County remain, as each time one is removed it is a loss to the history of Howard County, especially when the house is the last one in the area. Mr. Hauser clarified that a duplex is being built and asked if Ms. Porta would be occupying the house. Ms. Porta said they are constructing a duplex, but she will not be living in it, as she is just the builder. Mr. Hauser recommended the house be saved and restored. Ms. Porta stated saving and restoring the house is not affordable for her to do. She was not even aware that the house was historic when purchasing the property. Mr. Carney showed on the drawing where the house is located and how the property lines are laid out. Retaining the house would make building duplexes very difficult. Mr. Hauser commented that it is a common problem in that real estate agents need to notify buyers if the property being purchased is historic. Mr. Hauser stated his advice is to save the house. Mr. Reich asked to clarify the number of lots owned. Ms. Porta stated they own six lots. She said that a duplex can be built on every two lots, so the plan is to eventually build three duplexes. Mr. Reich asked about the setbacks for a single family house, and if it would be possible to build a single family house on one of the narrow lots. Mr. Carney stated the setback would be around a 7.5 foot side setback; these lots are 25 feet wide. This would make the house about 10 foot wide. Mr. Roth asked if the property was already subdivided into six lots when purchased. Ms. Porta stated yes. Mr. Carney stated Harwood Park had been subdivided around 100 years ago into lots of 25 feet wide and about 120 feet deep when railroad communities were commonly divided into small lots like the Harwood Park community. Ms. Porta stated every lot in the subdivision is the same size. Mr. Carney stated a pre-submission community meeting was held. The main concern of the residents was parking and safety along the streets. Mr. Reich asked if there were any items inside the house worth salvaging. Ms. Porta stated the only items really worth salvaging are some of the beams, which Mr. Porta would keep.

Ms. Tennor said that the Commission is constrained because they can only offer advisory comments, and the area was subdivided very oddly. The subdivision contains lots that are too small to build a house on; it takes two lots for one structure. Ms. Tennor stated the design and proposal of the duplex is good and reasonable. Ms. Tennor does not want to see the old house removed as it has a lot of historic charm, which the new house would not have. Mr. Roth concurs that the old house should stay and not

be demolished. Mr. Reich asked if the house could be preserved and the remaining property re-subdivided to give the lots necessary space. Ms. Porta stated no, the property was purchased with the knowledge that 3 duplexes could fit into the plan. It would not be cost effective if only two houses were built instead of three. Mr. Reich asked about re-drawing the lot lines. Ms. Porta stated this would not give enough space to do the project. Ms. Porta stated if she had prior knowledge about the historic house and the issues that could arise, she would have re-evaluated purchasing the property. Mr. Reich asked about re-doing the lines. Mr. Carney stated the individual house is 17.5 feet wide. There are some ways to reconfigure the lots without going through subdivision processing. The SDP could be waived in order to go directly to building permits, only if the waiver is approved. Environmental site design is being done to satisfy some of Planning and Zoning's comments for doing stormwater management. A full subdivision would require stormwater management for every lot. In order to avoid this, the lots need to be kept as is.

The Commission members summarized that they would prefer to see the historic house remain.

15-18 – 8086 Main Street, Ellicott City

Install sign.

Applicant: Megan Clark

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to install a vinyl sign on the first floor storefront window. The sign will be a circle, 2 ½ feet in diameter, for a total of 6 ½ square feet. The vinyl decal sign will be placed in the center of the window. The sign will read:

Pretty Things
oh my!

The text will line the perimeter of the store logo/graphic, which will be between the two lines of text. The graphic is dark gray, aqua, pink and green on a beige background. The graphic is the branding and logo for the store.

Staff Comments: The application generally complies with Chapter 11 recommendations. The sign will use "simple, legible words and graphics" and will "keep letters to a minimum and the message brief and to the point" as recommended in Chapter 11.A. While Chapter 11.A also recommends using "a minimum of colors, generally no more than three," the colors are the logo for the business and the sign will not be very large. The colors in the logo coordinate and do not clash with the building façade, as recommended by Chapter 11.A.

The sign will be a window decal. The text will surround the logo, but will not have a background. Staff recommends extending the background to include the text and then adding a border around the text. Staff has no preference on the color of the border. By extending the background to include the text, it will make the text more readable on the glass window.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted, but recommends extending the background to include the text and adding a border around the round logo.

Testimony: The Applicant was not present, but Megan Reuwer had been asked to represent Ms. Clark. Ms. Tennor swore in Megan Reuwer. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff report. Ms. Reuwer asked to clarify the staff recommendation for the type of edge for the sign. Ms. Holmes said that staff was recommending an extension of the white so it creates a background behind the text so that the text can be seen.

Mr. Hauser stated there will be two signs for the business, a projecting sign and a round sign. Ms. Reuwer clarified that the window decal is being referred to and will be the same logo as the other sign. Mr. Hauser asked if the projecting sign was needed with the sign in the window. Ms. Reuwer stated yes, as the higher sign can be seen from a distance. The window sign cannot be seen until being right at the window. Ms. Tennor requested to discuss the two signs together. Mr. Taylor clarified that cases 15-18 and 15-14 were being consolidated. Ms. Tennor said that was correct.

Ms. Tennor stated this is a great identity program with a number of elements. Ms. Tennor suggested the two panels on the projecting sign should be the same size. She said the smaller sign could be widened and the logo would sit beside the text. Ms. Reuwer stated she is fine with this, as long as the sign does not exceed the allowed square footage. Mr. Hauser stated he feels the round window sign is fine with the expanded border. As far as the projecting sign, he finds both signs are fine as shown. Mr. Hauser likes the two different sized signs. Mr. Reich also agrees with Mr. Hauser that both signs look fine and should be kept different sizes since they identify different businesses. Mr. Roth also agrees with the two different sized signs.

Ms. Reuwer stated the Applicant has notified her that she is on the way, so would like to postpone both cases until Ms. Clark arrives. The Commission agreed and moved on to the next case.

The other case closed and this case was re-opened. Ms. Tennor swore in Megan Clark. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections regarding the Staff comments of the window sign. Ms. Clark understands that a background should be added to make the lettering more visible. Ms. Tennor stated the circle can be expanded to create a background behind the lettering. Ms. Clark agreed and said it would not be a problem. The Commission also agreed with this solution.

Regarding the projecting sign, a consensus has not been reached on the Commission. Ms. Tennor does not agree with the signs being different sizes. The other three Commission members were fine with the sign as presented. Ms. Tennor asked if there is any possibility of adding a third hanging sign. Ms. Reuwer stated no, as the building is now fully leased.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve HPC-15-18 per Staff recommendations with an expanded border, and HPC-15-14 per Staff recommendations. Mr. Reich seconded. Ms. Tennor opposed. The motion was approved 3 votes to 1.

15-14 – 8086 Main Street, Ellicott City

Install sign.

Applicant: Megan Reuwer

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to install two double sided projecting signs hung from the same bracket. The signs will contain the business names of the two tenants in the building. There is an existing bracket on the building, but a new black metal scroll bracket will be installed in approximately the same location.

The Applicant originally submitted an application for one sign to contain two different business names, for the businesses that will reside on the first and second floor of the building. Staff found the Applicant's sign contained too much information for one sign and was concerned it could be outdated if either business left the building. Staff suggested the current concept to the Applicant, to which the Applicant agreed. The signs will be MDO wood with a digital print overlay and will be ½ inch thick.

The background of the signs will be white and they will have a purple border. The first sign will read 'The Massage Boutique' with their logo above the text. The Commission previously approved this businesses window decal sign in February 2015. The sign will be 36 inches wide by 10 inches high, for a total of 2.5 square feet. The second sign will read 'Pretty Things oh my!' on three lines, with their graphic included as well. This sign will be presented later in the agenda for a Certificate of Approval.

Staff Comments: Staff originally placed this item on the consent agenda, and only removed it because it did not seem appropriate to approve this application until the window sign for 'Pretty Things, oh my!' was approved. The application complies with Chapter 11 recommendations, "use simple, legible words and graphics" and "keep letters to and the message brief and to the point." The projecting signs also comply with Chapter 11.B recommendations, "limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City's small, attached commercial buildings."

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the two double sided projecting signs.

Testimony: Case 15-14 was heard in consolidation with Case 15-18. The approval for this case is part of the motion for 15-18.

15-19 – 3765 Church Road, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations and repairs.

Applicant: Archana Leon-Guerrero

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1872. The Applicant was previously approved in July 2014 to make repairs to the porch. Since then, the Applicant has started receiving estimates for the work. The Applicant proposes to replace or repair the front and back porch floor, railings and columns with materials to match the existing as closely as possible. The specific work includes:

1. Install a transition slip along the front edge of the porch floor, replace tongue/groove floorboards in front of the transition slip with flooring that will be slightly wider than the existing flooring.
2. Replace wood porch balusters with slightly smaller ones.
3. Replace fluted, tapered wood columns with either no flutes and/or no tapering, depending upon what is available.
4. Add gray snow guards to the metal roof on the main house.
5. Remove wood shutters from the carriage house, which are in disrepair.
6. Remove wood shutters from the back side of the main house, which are also in disrepair.

Staff Comments: Staff reviewed the file for this property and found that the front porch used to have a ¼ wall covered in asbestos siding with ¾ columns. These appear to have been removed in 1976 and most likely the current fluted, tapered columns were installed. The previous columns appear to be smooth. The porch floor was painted light blue in 1989, but it is unknown if it was painted prior to then. The Applicant is having issues with rot on the front porch floor. Staff has recommended the Applicant look into different varieties of wood such as Ipe, a water resistant Brazilian hardwood, which if used, would not be painted. The Applicant has also mentioned using a trex-like floor on the front and rear porch, but the application does not contain any specifics on replacement materials. Staff recommends against using any material other than wood on the front porch. Chapter 6.F of the Guidelines recommend against, "adding or replacing porch features using materials not appropriate to the building's style. Materials generally not appropriate for historic porch replacements include unpainted pressure treated wood, poured concrete and metal (other than cast iron porches). Examples of

inappropriate alterations include replacing painted, tongue and groove flooring with pressure treated decking or poured concrete or replacing wood steps with concrete or brick.” Staff has no objection to replacing painted wood with a natural unpainted wood which is more water resistant and would present less maintenance issues than a painted porch floor.

The rear porch is an addition, but the date of construction is unknown. The porch appears to sit on a concrete block foundation. Staff has no objection to using an alternate material on this porch floor as it is not original to the building and not highly visible from the street. The Guidelines do not offer advice on the use of trex or similar modern materials, but like other non-historic materials, it is most appropriate to be used on non-historic or not highly visible parts of the structure. Staff has no objection to the use of trex on the rear deck, but would prefer wood, which would keep materials consistent throughout the building.

The Applicant also proposes to paint the house and carriage house white, with black window trim. The paint colors comply with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building” and “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings.” The house is currently white. The only change in color is the window trim is currently white and the Applicant proposes to change it to black. Staff recommends the vines growing on the side of the carriage house be completely removed, as they will cause damage to the siding.

Staff has requested more information regarding the replacement materials for the front and rear porch, an explanation of what the ‘transition slip’ is, and confirmation that the entire house will be painted. Staff would also like to see more information on the material and design of the snow guards.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends:

1. Denial of replacing the front porch floor with any material other than wood. If replaced with wood, Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work.
2. Approval of replacing rear porch floor with trex or similar material, as it is not highly visible but Staff would prefer wood to be used.
3. Approval of replacing wood porch balusters with slightly smaller balusters, to be wood painted white and of the same style as the existing and tax credit pre-approval for the work.
4. Approval of replacing the fluted, tapered wood columns with wood columns of a different style, and tax credit pre-approval for the work.
5. Approval of removing the wood shutters.
6. Approval of painting the house and carriage house and tax credit pre-approval for the work, including the repair of any wood siding or trim as needed
7. Approval of the installation of snow guards and tax credit pre-approval if the guards are metal to match the roof.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Archana Leon-Guerrero. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Leon-Guerrero explained that she purchased the home 8 years ago and at the time, the house was in good shape. Ms. Leon-Guerrero stated it has been very difficult to maintain both the house and carriage house. It has been a problem finding contractors to obtain a quote from and the structures continue to fall into disrepair. Ms. Leon-Guerrero stated the HPC had given approval and tax credit pre-approval back in July 2014 for repair/replacement of the porch, the columns, the railings, the shutters. All of these have rotted and are in disrepair. Ms. Leon-Guerrero stated the reason she was not receiving quotes is that most of the contractors did not specialize in historic homes and no one wanted to take on the work of a 4-story building on such a steep slope. Ms. Leon-Guerrero said she had every intention of using wood, but could not find anyone to do it.

She said that she finally located contractors who specialize in historic preservation and they recommended using a material called 'Aeratis', which is a composite porch flooring material. The width of Aeratis is narrower than the modern day planks. There is also another type of material that is similar and can be painted over. Ms. Leon-Guerrero stated a decision has not been made yet which one will be used. The current railings and fluted columns, which are wood, would be kept.

Ms. Leon-Guerrero said there are two columns that are rotting and would need replacing. The structural engineer recommended that Duracast be used instead of re-milling wood columns, due to the load the columns would be holding. If the Duracast is not used, the engineer recommended placing a beam inside the current hollow columns. The beam would help hold up the house, and the fluted columns could be repaired.

Ms. Leon-Guerrero said that Aeratis was recommended for the porch floor because the porch roof had not been built with the proper overhang. The overhang is supposed to extend out about 6 inches more than it does. The water is hitting the ground and bouncing back on the edge of the porch, which is causing rot. There have been several repairs of the porch edge. Ms. Tennor clarified that the information received reveals a design flaw in the original structure. Ms. Leon-Guerrero said yes. Because of the design flaw, the rain cannot properly be kept off the edges. Ms. Leon-Guerrero had been waiting for feedback regarding the back porch. According to the contractor, the wood is warped, but can probably be repaired. This porch does not have the same issues as the front porch. She said that she's previously received tax credit pre-approval for the porch and she hopes by using the same wood, this is still valid.

Mr. Hauser clarified that he has never worked on Ms. Leon-Guerrero's home and does not need to recuse himself. Mr. Hauser stated that if contractors are suggesting composite wood for the front porch, the right contractors have not been found. He said that wood will last a long time, if it is prepared correctly. Lumber companies carry mahogany flooring and it can be painted the same color as the existing flooring. The rotten flooring can be patched and painted. Mr. Hauser explained that using wood will provide a 25% tax credit; this would cover the difference between the mahogany and yellow pine. Mr. Hauser does not believe the fluted columns are original to the house. The columns would probably have been white round columns, tapered or non-tapered. Mr. Hauser agrees that a Permacast column could be used on the front porch; round columns would be better. Ms. Leon-Guerrero said that not all columns are being replaced, just the two which are rotting. The columns would need to match the others. Mr. Hauser stated if all the columns were replaced, Permacast could be used and the product does come as structural. The columns look just like wood when painted. Mr. Hauser said that if fluted columns are used, structural ones can also be purchased. Mr. Hauser has no objection to replacing the two columns fluted with fluted columns, or using smooth round columns if they are all replaced. Permacast would also be acceptable. The front porch must be wood; it cannot be composite material. The back porch remaining in wood would be a tax credit.

Mr. Hauser asked if both the front and back balusters need replacing. Ms. Leon-Guerrero stated the bottom rail for the balusters is rotting and needs replacing, and a number of the balusters are also rotting and must be replaced. Mr. Hauser asked if the balusters can be found in a similar style. The contractors stated the exact baluster could not be found, but the balusters in stock would be a bit smaller. Mr. Hauser stated the existing balusters are decorative and asked if the contractor is suggesting to use straight balusters, or replacing the balusters in-kind. Ms. Leon-Guerrero stated they will be replaced in-kind, but are just a bit smaller. Mr. Hauser suggested removing a line of balusters that are in good shape and grouping them together, so that any new, smaller balusters can be grouped together along the back rail. Mr. Hauser said it is fine to paint the house and install snow guards. He explained there is no way to stop the water from blowing over or going into the lower room, unless the eaves would be extended. This would need a design and would need to come back to the Commission. The wood shutters on the carriage house and the main house are in bad shape. Mr. Hauser would like to see

the shutters put back on the carriage house. Mr. Hauser had no objection to the proposed paint colors.

Mr. Reich agreed with Mr. Hauser that there are a lot of wood products that would work better than composite and should last a long time. He agreed that the balusters should be replaced with the same design, not a different design. Ms. Leon-Guerrera stated the plan is to replace all the balusters. Mr. Reich stated the shutters are falling apart and agreed they should be replaced. Ms. Leon-Guerrera said the front house shutters will remain as they are in fairly good shape, but the remainder will be removed. Mr. Reich is in agreement with Staff regarding the painting and metal snow guards.

Mr. Roth had nothing to add, except for some comments on the use of plastic for the porch flooring. He asked how long would the composite product last; will it sag after a period of time; what will it look like after a number of years. He explained these questions could be a problem. Ms. Tennor spoke about the composite sample for the flooring. She said it is plastic with wood fibers buried in the interior. The Commission will not be agreeable with plastic replacing wood. Ms. Holmes said that the application is for a Certificate of Approval, so the Commission can deny the use of the composite material. Ms. Tennor asked if the shutters have really deteriorated in the 8 years the Applicant has lived there. Ms. Leon-Guerrera stated yes they have. Ms. Tennor would like to see all the shutters replaced, especially the carriage house shutters.

Mr. Bennett asked if there are downspouts on all sides of the house. Ms. Leon-Guerrera stated yes. Mr. Bennett stated the problem with the water hitting the front porch is that both the gutter and downspouts are probably too small to handle the flow of water. The proper size for the gutter and downspouts needs to be determined. Ms. Leon-Guerrera stated these items are going to be replaced. Snow guards will also be installed to help prevent the snow and ice from falling down so hard. Mr. Bennett stated if the snow guards hold the snow for too long, it can become a problem. He also suggested using a snow rail on the roof. Ms. Tennor said that if the current gutters are just 4 inches consideration should be given to using 6 inch gutters. The 6 inch gutters work much better and the size is not noticeable.

Ms. Tennor had begun a motion, but Mr. Hauser asked to stop the motion to clarify some information. He said that for the back porch that using wood provides a tax credit and that using composite does not. Mr. Hauser asked the Applicant to clarify if all the balusters are being replaced. Ms. Leon-Guerrera said this is one of the options. Mr. Hauser said the motion needs to allow the flexibility for the Applicant to replace all balusters to be the same size, or if only a couple are replaced, then they should be separated and not put together. Mr. Hauser said the Applicant should have the flexibility to replace two columns only in wood, but in fluted or smooth round. Ms. Leon-Guerrera said she would probably use fluted. She added that Permacast also comes in fluted. Mr. Hauser said that tax credits should be discussed on the columns. He said that tax credits are not eligible if the Permacast is used, but that wood columns would receive tax credits. Ms. Leon-Guerrera asked about placing a beam inside the hollow column. Ms. Tennor said the beam would be important for structural support, but the Commission is concerned about the outside appearance. Mr. Taylor stated there is a question regarding tax credit pre-approval. If the Applicant used a wood column with a beam inside, it is structural and would need tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Tennor asked if the final decision of the Applicant on the materials used should come back to Staff for review. Ms. Holmes stated yes, as there are too many variables and options.

Mr. Taylor started to review each recommendation to ascertain what the Commission is approving. During his review, Ms. Leon-Guerrera offered another suggestion for the front porch which would be using a transition strip on the front edge of the porch. Mr. Taylor repeated that the Applicant would like the option of replacing the front porch with wood, or repair the damaged section with the addition of a transition strip, and if the Commission will approve this option. The Commission disagreed as this option had not been discussed earlier. Ms. Tennor did not find that it was a good solution. Mr. Hauser stated

this would change the character of the wood porch.

Mr. Taylor suggested going into 'closed session' for legal advice. Mr. Hauser moved to go into closed session. Ms. Tennor seconded. The vote was unanimous. The meeting went off the record.

The meeting was continued back on record.

Mr. Taylor asked the Applicant if she wanted the option to replace or match the existing transition strip, or is not considering the option. Ms. Leon-Guerrera stated yes this option is being considered, with or without the transition strip. Mr. Taylor stated the code discussion in closed session was regarding replacing or repairing the wood porch to match the existing. He said this is considered routine maintenance. Since the front porch was not constructed to be historically appropriate, due to the transition strip being added, tax credit pre-approval would not be appropriate for the work. Ms. Leon-Guerrera clarified the transition strip work is not eligible for tax credit. Mr. Taylor stated yes. Ms. Leon-Guerrera stated if the Commission does not like the strip, then it will not be used.

Motion: Ms. Tennor read the recommendations to confirm approval. Mr. Taylor re-stated the recommendations to clarify. The Commission is to Approve per Staff recommendations:

1. Denial of replacing the front porch floor with any material other than wood. If replaced with wood, Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work. This does not include any replacement that uses a transition strip, but can be a staggered replacement (toothing in) for tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Tennor added 'or a straight line cut across'.
2. Approval of replacing rear porch floor with trex or similar material, as it is not highly visible, but wood would be preferred and tax credit pre-approval would be given if wood is used.
3. Replacing wood porch balusters in part or in its entirety. If replaced in part, the balusters should be grouped so the sizes are consistent and not interspersed. Tax credit pre-approval for the work.
4. Approval of replacing the two deteriorating wood columns with tax credit pre-approval if they match the existing, with the option of replacing all columns with a smooth round wood column and tax credit pre-approval, with the additional option to use a hollow column that matches the existing with an interior structural post. An approval to use the Permacast columns, but with no tax credit pre-approval.
5. Approval of removing the wood shutters as discussed.
6. Approval of painting the house and carriage house and tax credit pre-approval for the work, including the repair of any wood siding or trim as needed.
7. Approval of the installation of snow guards or snow rail and tax credit pre-approval if the guards or rail are metal to match the roof.

Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

15-20 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Megan Reuwer

Background & Scope of Work: Staff does not know the exact date of this building, but it does show up on the 1959 Sanborn maps and is constructed of concrete block, leading Staff to believe it dates to approximately the 1950s. The Applicant proposes to reface the existing concrete block building with DryVit stucco. The DryVit will be a dark gray color called 'Citation'. The existing red and black trim colors will remain the same, but will be freshened up with new paint.

The Applicant also seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff Comments: The building would need to be historically significant to be eligible for the tax credit and Staff finds that if it was historically significant, then it also wouldn't be appropriate to cover it in DryVit. The Commission needs to determine if the building meets the follow criteria from Section 20.112 of the County Code, in order to be eligible for the tax credit:

An existing principal structure located within a local historic district in Howard County, which is determined by the Commission to be of historic or architectural significance, or to be architecturally compatible with the historic structures in the district.

If the Commission determines the building to be historically significant, then the Commission also needs to determine if the proposal is the most appropriate treatment for the building. Staff has no objection to the proposal and finds the building does not meet the threshold of being considered historically significant.

Chapter 6.C recommends, "Maintain or restore original brick, stone, concrete block or stucco. Make repairs with materials that match the original as closely as possible" and recommends against "replacing or covering original masonry construction." However, Staff does not find that the building is historically significant and finds that covering the concrete block with DryVit stucco will improve the aesthetic of the building.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of covering the building with DryVit, but recommends against tax credit pre-approval.

Testimony: Ms. Reuwer was already sworn in. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Reuwer said that she agreed with the Staff report and that the building is not historically significant and not eligible for tax credit pre-approval. Mr. Hauser asked if the block building that was originally going to be demolished will remain the same with the block and untouched. Ms. Reuwer stated yes, the three story block building will remain. There was exterior repair done to the building. Mr. Hauser asked if a roof was being proposed for this building. Ms. Holmes stated the application is only for covering the building with DryVit and painting. Mr. Hauser asked if the façade will remain the same. Ms. Reuwer stated yes. The doors will be painted red and the windows black. Mr. Hauser has no issues with using DryVit. The other Commission members had no comments.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application as submitted. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-21 – 3713 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs and alterations, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Megan Reuwer

Background & Scope of Work: The exact date of construction of this building is also unknown, but it also shows up on the 1959 Sanborn maps. Similar to 3711 Old Columbia Pike, it is also concrete block construction. The Applicant proposes to make the following exterior alterations:

1. Cover the exterior of the building in DryVit stucco material, in the color Midnight Blue.
2. Add a concrete pad for exterior dining in front of the building (where the current parking pad is located).
3. Install gray metal railing around exterior dining area. Staff has requested a spec sheet/detail of

the proposed railing.

4. Add standing seam metal porch roof in silver smith or classic bronze. Wood supports for the standing seam porch roofline will be treated wood, stained in a chestnut color.
5. Install decorative trim around large picture window, paint around all windows to be Sherwin William Divine White, or comparable. The proposed trim is shown in the color rendering. Staff has requested a spec sheet/detail of the trim.
6. Open up previously closed in windows, as shown in the color rendering provided with the application. Install new window glass in these areas. Staff has requested a spec sheet of the new windows.
7. Enlarge the closed window on the front façade to the right of the entrance doors, to match the size of other existing window on the left façade. Staff has requested a spec sheet of the window.
8. The windows on the side of the building facing the access road for parking will remain closed.
9. Add decorative cap to the flat roofline, as shown in the rendering. The cap will be painted Sherwin William Nomadic Dessert, a tan, or a similar color. Staff has requested additional information regarding the material of the proposed cap.
10. Replace the double metal entrance doors with new double glass doors and add decorative molding to the top of the entrance recess to match the molding that will be installed around the windows. The trim color will be Sherwin Williams Divine White or a similar color. Staff has requested a spec sheet of the new doors.
11. Add a new rooftop dining area, with interior stairway access bumpout. The bumpout will have a standing seam metal roof to match the front porch roof color. DryVit stucco will be applied on the enclosure, and painted Nomadic Dessert, or comparable. Install safety railing around dining area on rooftop deck, to match the sidewalk patio railing. Staff has requested a spec sheet of the new door and information on the decking material.
12. Paint the exit door on the back of the building Nomadic Dessert, or a similar color.

Staff Comments: The building would need to be historically significant to be eligible for the tax credit and Staff finds that if it was historically significant, then it also wouldn't be appropriate to cover it in DryVit and make some of the other proposed alterations. The Commission needs to determine if the building meets the follow criteria from Section 20.112 of the County Code, in order to be eligible for the tax credit:

An existing principal structure located within a local historic district in Howard County, which is determined by the Commission to be of historic or architectural significance, or to be architecturally compatible with the historic structures in the district.

If the Commission determines the building to be historically significant, then the Commission also needs to determine if the proposal is the most appropriate treatment for the building. Staff has no objection to the proposal and finds that while the building is older, it does not meet the threshold of being considered historically significant.

Chapter 6.C recommends, "Maintain or restore original brick, stone, concrete block or stucco. Make repairs with materials that match the original as closely as possible" and recommends against "replacing or covering original masonry construction." However, Staff does not find that the building is historically significant and finds that covering the concrete block with DryVit stucco will improve the aesthetic of the building.

Chapter 9.D of the Guidelines recommends against "new patios of poured concrete slabs in readily visible locations." Staff recommends the Applicant consider installing a front patio of bluestone/flagstone in place of the concrete, which would complement the new building color. A gray metal railing will also be added. There was no drawing or photo of the proposed railing and Staff has

requested additional information. However, the gray railing is darker color, which complies with Chapter 9.D recommendations, “install open fencing generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal.”

A porch roof will be added to the front of the building. This is also something that would not be appropriate if the building was historically significant, however, in this case Staff finds it will enhance the building and the streetscape. The new porch roof complies with Chapter 7.B recommendations, “design new porches and decks to be simple, compatible in design with the existing building, and in scale with the existing building in size and roof height.” Staff recommends a gray roof, which will be compatible with the gray railing and the blue stucco. The use of a metal roof is also consistent with Chapter 9.E, which explains that historic roofing materials include “wood shingles, metal and slate.”

Opening up the windows that have been closed in complies with Chapter 6.H recommendations, “restore window openings that have been filled in using physical, pictorial or documentary evidence to accurately restore the building’s historic appearance.” Staff has requested additional information regarding the specific type and material of the new windows.

The double metal entrance doors will also be replaced with glass doors. Staff has requested a spec sheet of the new doors. Staff has also requested additional information on the decorative cap that will be added to the roofline and the door and window trim. However, if done correctly, these items will also enhance the building façade and streetscape.

The Guidelines do not offer advice on the rooftop deck and bumpout. However, the deck will not be visible from the public right of way. The deck will be most visible from the neighboring building at 8197 Main Street, which the Applicant also owns and is part of the same project. The door bumpout will be constructed with the same materials that will be used on the rest of the building, which complies with Chapter 7.A recommendations, “on any building, use exterior materials and colors (including roof, walls and foundations) similar to or compatible with the texture and color of those on the existing building.”

The new paint colors comply with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details such as doors or trim.

Staff Recommendation: Contingent upon receiving additional information on the items requested above, Staff recommends Approval. Staff recommends against tax credit pre-approval as Staff find the building does not qualify.

Testimony: Ms. Reuwer was already sworn in. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Reuwer stated she agreed this building is not historically significant and should not receive tax credit pre-approval, and also agreed with the Staff report. Mr. Hauser asked if there would be any problem with repairing and painting the brick the same color versus putting on DryVit and asked if there was a benefit in using Dryvit. Ms. Reuwer stated due to the proximity to the river of the buildings, DryVit would be more protective and long term. The brick is not in good condition. She explained that a lot of work needs to be done and the building needs to look nice and have a consistent facade. Mr. Hauser stated he is fine with DryVit on the sides, but does not like DryVit on the façade facing the road and found that it detracts from the historic district. He said the front brick could be repaired if it was properly prepared and painted, and would last just as long. He explained that it would retain some historic character. Ms. Reuwer asked if removing bricks for the window request would be a problem. Mr. Hauser said that would not be a problem. Mr. Hauser stated

once the brick is painted, the repairs will not be seen. He also would not have any issues with the windows, the front patio, or the top deck.

Mr. Reich stated the building is in full view of an open area and the blue color will stick out. He said that a more subdued color would look better if the brick is not being restored. Ms. Reuwer stated the proposed blue will be used as it is part of the restaurant concept. Ms. Reuwer said the blue was the color of the DryVit and if the Commission does not allow DryVit, she will have to find another similar color for painting the brick. Ms. Reuwer said that the blue is important for the continuity of the project and restaurant. Mr. Hauser asked if the blue could be a shade darker. Ms. Reuwer stated it could be a bit darker. She clarified the color will not be a bright blue and that the architect's drawing is misleading on the color. Ms. Tennor stated she has no objection to the blue. In regard to color, Ms. Tennor asked what color will be used on the building next to this one. Ms. Reuwer stated the building has already been painted and is grey with black accents. Mr. Reich thinks the blue building will be out of place.

Ms. Reuwer said the building will have a metal accent porch. Mr. Roth asked if the building is currently painted or if the existing color was natural. Ms. Reuwer stated it is painted. Mr. Roth asked about the cornice along the roofline. Ms. Reuwer stated it will be a metal cap. The two preferred color choices would be tan or bronze.

Mr. Reich commented that there is not enough information on the submitted concept plan to show exactly what all the details are of each aspect of the plan. Mr. Reich asked if they would get a set of construction drawings. Ms. Reuwer said they won't have construction drawings until it is approved. Mr. Reich and Ms. Tennor considered the application a concept.

Mr. Reich asked what the fascia detail looks like, what the gutter looks like, what size are the porch brackets, dimensions for the trim around the window and coping, material of the trim around the window. Mr. Roth said the diagram should be more accurate. Mr. Hauser suggested approving the concept of the plan and let Ms. Reuwer work on the general idea, but the details would need to come back.

Mr. Hauser asked what material the patio will be. Ms. Reuwer said it was originally going to be stamped concrete, but Staff recommend flagstone, which they are open to.

Mr. Reich said the patio is a good idea, but that more information is needed. Mr. Taylor requested the building go through the list of materials used on the building. Mr. Hauser said he is opposed to DryVit on the sides on the front of the building, but is fine with it on the sides. Mr. Reich said he is opposed to it on the front and on the side that can be seen from the road. Mr. Roth does not think DryVit is a good idea. Mr. Hauser said the side of the building is block. Mr. Reich said he would prefer to have concrete block on the side. The Commission discussed the block and use of DryVit further. Ms. Reuwer said they will not only be using DryVit on the back of the building.

Ms. Tennor said she did not have an objection to dining in front of the building and asked if anyone had an objection. Mr. Roth asked where the parking was. Ms. Reuwer said there is a back parking lot that they own. Mr. Hauser said they don't know what the concrete pad is. Ms. Tennor said they will need to come back with those details, but asked if there was an objection to outdoor dining in front of the building. Mr. Hauser said the Commission does not decide on outdoor dining which is a use. Mr. Taylor said the Commission has approval over the materials used in construction of the dining area. Ms. Tennor said they need more information on Item 2. Ms. Burgess pointed out that Ms. Reuwer is open to discussion on the material of the flooring. Mr. Roth asked generally if there was a concrete area with a railing, would the Commission be ok with that. Mr. Hauser said that he would prefer to see stone. Ms. Tennor asked if the Commission was ready to make a recommendation on that item. Ms. Reuwer asked

to bring more information on this item later. Ms. Reuwer said the metal railing is actually black. The Commission members had no objection to the railing.

Ms. Tennor moved on to Item #4, the standing seam metal porch roof. Mr. Hauser said they need a more detailed drawing of the porch, showing gutters, ceiling, fascia, roof material and stain color of the wood.

Ms. Tennor moved on to Item #5, the windows. Mr. Hauser asked about a detail of the trim. Ms. Reuwer stated the information was in the supplement and was the Azek product. She said she would have the architect come back with the detail. Ms. Reuwer asked for what was meant by detail. Mr. Hauser said a sample would be fine. Mr. Reich said it appears there is a header trim and thin trim around the edges of the windows, and a window sill. Mr. Reich said a section and elevation of a typical window would be good to have. He asked for more information regarding the profile of the trim and the dimensions.

Ms. Tennor moved on to Item #6, opening the closed in windows. Ms. Reuwer said the new windows were referenced in the supplementary info. She said they will be Jeld-Wen standard white aluminum picture windows. Mr. Reich said that he was confused about that information as well, as the current photo shows three smaller windows and a larger window. Ms. Reuwer said that was correct and explained they are requesting to make a large window where the two smaller ones used to be and to close in the other window. Mr. Reich requested an elevation, to scale, showing the dimension of the proposed window. Ms. Tennor confirmed that the windows on the side of the building will remain closed in. Ms. Reuwer asked what the treatment will be since DryVit wasn't being recommended by the Commission. Ms. Reuwer said it will not look good, but the bricked in windows will be painted over.

The Commission moved on to discussing the metal roof cap. Mr. Roth said it does not look very decorative. Mr. Hauser said a plain metal cap will go with the building since it is a warehouse. Ms. Tennor thought the cap was fine.

The Commission moved in to Item 10, the doors. Ms. Reuwer said she needed to amend that item and that she has a new spec sheet for the door. Mr. Hauser said the generally he would have a problem with the door. He explained that the building is a warehouse on a historic street. He said the building is non-contributing, but thinks the building should look like a warehouse. He said he would prefer to see the proposed door, without all of the detail, but would be ok with it as is. Mr. Reich said the doors look out of place to him. Mr. Roth said he doesn't have a coherent understanding of what the building will look like.

Ms. Reuwer stated it may be difficult to come back, as she feels the plan accurately shows what is intended to be done with the supplemental material. Mr. Roth stated the plan is not consistent with the supplemental material. Mr. Reich stated a standard, regular front elevation and section is needed showing exactly what the building will look like. Mr. Roth stated the perspective rendering needs to match the supplemental package. Mr. Reich said that dimensions are needed.

Mr. Taylor stated the Applicant is now aware that the application will not be approved. He suggested the case be continued to next month's meeting, with no further advertising, and present new renderings incorporating the supplemental material.

Ms. Reuwer asked if the rooftop schematic is sufficient as shown. Mr. Reich stated no, as a lot of it will show from the street. He said a scaled drawing is needed. A front elevation is needed and details on the stairwell. Ms. Holmes pointed out there is a building on Main Street with a similar roof deck and is slightly visible from the street. Mr. Reich wants to see on an elevation what will be visible on the roof above the parapet.

Mr. Taylor asked if the Applicant is willing to continue to the next meeting. Ms. Reuwer stated yes. Mr. Taylor asked if the Commission agrees. The Commission stated yes.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved that this case be continued to next month's meeting and that the materials requested include elevation, architectural elevation, scale and dimensions with the materials indicated for everything that will be seen from the façade coordinated. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-22 – 6130 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge

Exterior repairs and alterations, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Jason Pollitt

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1890. This building is located in the Lawyers Hill Historic District. The Applicant does not currently own the house, but has submitted an offer to purchase it. The house is not in good condition, but can be rehabilitated. The Applicant has submitted photographs and an explanation of several of the problems with the structure, which include missing siding shingles, missing windows on the rear of the house and missing shutters.

The Applicant proposes the following work:

1. Replace missing cedar shingles on siding and paint siding dark green (Benjamin Moore Seaweed) and trim off-white/cream (Cotton Tail).
2. Replace missing shutters and repair/replace other shutters as needed. Paint shutters Dark Brick Red or Dark Brown, color to be Behr Wild Horse. Approximately 8 shutters will be replaced with wood louvered shutters, to match the existing.
3. Replace rotted basement door with a solid wood door of either stained wood or a dark color to be determined. The new basement door with either be a 6 panel wood door or a 4 panel wood door.
4. The 2nd floor split door in the kitchen is rotted. The door will be replaced with a new wood split door and also stained or painted a dark color to be determined. The proposed new split doors will have 3 lites over 2 panels or 1 lite over 2 panels.
5. Rear kitchen window is 6:6 and is missing multiple panes and rotting. Replace with wood 6:6 double hung window.
6. Replace all nine windows in 2nd floor enclosed rear porch. The windows are currently 1:1 aluminum storm windows. The new windows will be wood 6:6 casement and custom made to fit the openings and match the other windows on the house.
7. Replace a basement window on the side of the house that is broken. Replace with wood 6:6 to match existing or repair if possible.
8. Replace glass on French doors located next to front door.
9. The windows on the rest of the house (aside from enclosed porch and one basement window) will be repaired.
10. Painted rear brick will be repainted brown to match existing.
11. Rear chimney needs repointing. The color of the mortar will match the existing as best as possible.
12. Replace rotten fascia with wood and paint off-white/cream color.
13. Replace porch light. The replacement light will be bronze as shown in the application. It is possible a different fixture will be used.
14. Replace roof with asphalt shingles in a light brown color. A dark brown color was also submitted if the Commission finds the light brown is not appropriate.

15. Replace hardware on doors using brass hardware. The existing hardware is in poor condition or missing.
16. Remove rusting pipes from the side of the house and the box surrounding them or clean and paint them black and remove box. These are the main sewage pipes. The Applicant has not yet researched the building code to determine what is feasible.
17. The front porch floorboards need replacement. The existing iron columns/porch supports will be sanded and painted black. Shore up porch as needed. The entire porch may need to be removed for repair work and rebuilt, and if that is determined, will be addressed in a future application.
18. Eventually construct a new rear porch in a separate future application. However, in the interim, install black metal railing/safety bar across the kitchen doorway for safety issues.

Staff Comments: According to MDAT the house dates to 1890. The application generally complies with Chapter 5 and 6 recommendations for Routine Maintenance and Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings. The replacement of missing cedar siding complies with Chapter 6.E (page 24) recommendations, “maintain and repair existing wood siding or wood shingles” and “when necessary, replace deteriorated wood siding or shingles with materials that match the original as closely as possible in texture, size, shape and that maintain the original shape and width of details such as cornerboards and door and window trim.” The replacement of the missing shutters, using wood shutters in the same style, complies with Chapter 6.I (page 28) recommendations, “for replacements, install wood shutters or wood blinds that main the size, proportions and locations of the originals.”

The replacement of the rotted 2nd floor kitchen and lower basement door comply with Chapter 6.K (page 29) recommendations, “when necessary, install replacement doors that are similar in style and finish to the original doors or appropriate to the style of the house.” The existing doors are rotten and cannot be repaired, so replacement doors are appropriate. The Applicant submitted two different options for each door; Staff finds both options for each door is appropriate for the style of the house.

The replacement of the windows referenced in Items 5-7 is consistent with Chapter 6.I recommendations, “if replacement is necessary, use windows that fit the original openings and are made of materials and in a style compatible with the style of the house. Reproduce window pane configuration, frame size and muntin detailing whenever possible.” The replacement windows will match the existing windows. In the case of the enclosed porch, the replacement windows will not match the existing 1:1 aluminum windows, but will be 6:6 which matches the rest of the house. The replacement of the glass on the front French doors and the repair of the windows on the remainder of the house is considered Routine Maintenance, which is defined in Chapter 6.I (page 28) as “repairing existing windows, including replacement of clear glass, repair of glazing putty, repainting (using color listed in Section O of this Chapter), and installation of weatherstripping.”

The painting of the previously painted brick on the rear of the house is considered Routine Maintenance, which is defined in Chapter 6.D (page 23) as “repainting painted surfaces using the colors listed in Section O of this chapter.” Section O references that brown is an appropriate color for a shingle style house. The repointing of the chimney with mortar to match as closely as possible complies with Chapter 6.D (page 22) recommendations, “use mortar mixes that are compatible with early brick and stone.” Staff does not consider the repair routine maintenance, which the Guidelines specify that the mortar should exactly match “the existing unweathered mortar in color, texture, joint profile and composition.”

The replacement of the rotten wood fascia with new wood fascia is considered Routine Maintenance, which is defined in Chapter 5 as, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.” The porch light will be replaced with a new fixture, which will most likely be a bronze fixture. The Applicant may

choose another fixture, so Staff recommends this item be left for Staff approval when a specific fixture has been decided on. Chapter 9.F recommends “design and locate lighting fixtures to be visually unobtrusive. Use dark metal or a similar unobtrusive material for freestanding lights.” The proposed fixture will not be freestanding, but may be bronze, a dark metal.

The current roof is a black asphalt roof that has faded significantly over the years. The Applicant proposes to install a new asphalt architectural shingle roof, in a light brown color. The Guidelines recommend, “when original roofing must be replaced, use material similar to the original or characteristic of the building’s period and style, particularly if the roof is visible from a public street or is a key element of the building’s style or character. Replacement with modern materials such as composition shingles may be approved if historically accurate roofing cannot reasonably be required for economic or other reasons.” This house does not have historic roofing material, it is currently roofed in asphalt shingle. The Guidelines do not offer recommendations for this scenario. The Guidelines define routine maintenance as “replacing roofing with new materials that exactly matches the original.” The replacement shingles will not match the current shingles, but Staff has no objection to the light brown shingles, which will complement the color scheme.

Chapter 6.N of the Guidelines states that “the installation of hardware, such as door or windows locks and doorknobs is considered Routine Maintenance and does not require a Certificate of Approval.” So the proposed brass hardware does not require approval from the Commission.

The removal of the sewage and vent pipes from the side of the house is also not something referenced in the Guidelines, however if this item is allowed by the building code, it would make the outside of the building more attractive. Staff has no objection to the work, as long as it is allowed by the building code to be installed in the interior of the house.

The replacement of the front porch floorboards with flooring to match the existing complies with Chapter 6.F (page 24) recommendations, “replace deteriorated features with new materials that match the original as closely as possible in material, design and finish.” The repair of the existing iron columns/porch supports complies with Chapter 6.F (page 24) recommendations, “maintain and repair porches, including flooring, railings, columns, supports, ornamentation and roofing that are original or appropriate to the building’s development and style.” The porch has what appears to be a temporary pressure treated railing along the steps and no railings around the porch. A future application will be needed to address these items, which will be required per the building code. Also, if it is determined that the entire front porch needs to be removed and replaced, this will also need to be addressed in a separate future application.

The rear kitchen door no longer opens onto a rear porch. The Applicant does plan on installing a porch, which will be a separate future application. However, in the interim the Applicant proposes to install a black metal railing/safety bar across the door opening. The Guidelines do not offer advice for this, but Staff finds the use of a dark metal railing to be consistent with other design features on the house, such as the front porch columns/supports.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends:

1. Approval of Items 1-15.
2. Tax credit pre-approval for items 1-15.
3. Staff approval of Item 16, subject to receiving more information on what is allowed per the building code and whether the pipes will just need to be hidden.
4. Approval and tax credit pre-approval for Item 17, the replacement of floorboards and repair of porch columns/support.
5. Approval of Item 18, adding a safety bar/railing across the rear kitchen door.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Toni Hammill, a family member representing the Applicant. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Hammill stated the Applicant intends to do all work in-kind. If the Commission has any changes or recommendations, the Applicant has no problem accepting them in order to obtain the approval. The Commission reviewed the list of items to see if any member had any concerns. Ms. Hammill stated the Applicant will submit any future applications in the event other work needs to be done.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application per the Staff recommendation. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Hauser moved to Adjourn the meeting. Mr. Reich seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Eileen Tennor, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary